

Appendix B

PUBLIC REVIEW COMMENTS TO THE DRAFT PLAN

The Planning Process included a public review period of one month in length. This period was concurrent with the review period established by the State Clearinghouse for the Initial Study/Negative Declaration. During this public review period, project staff members were available for informational presentations and questions regarding the Draft Comprehensive Management Plan. Two public input meetings on the Draft Plan were held in the latter part of the public review period and a presentations to the SRCAF Board of Directors was also made. Appendix B documents the comments that were received including the following materials:

- B-1 Summary of the December 1, 2003 Public Input Meeting on the Draft Plan .
- B-2 Summary of the December 4, 2003 Public Input Meeting on the Draft Plan.
- B-3 Written comments received regarding the Draft Plan and the Initial Study / Negative Declaration.
 - ◆ Denny Bungarz, Chairman, Glenn County Board of Supervisors
 - ◆ Burt Bundy, Manager, Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum
 - ◆ Jim Dwyer, Chico, California
 - ◆ Jeffrey P. Sutton, Executive Director, Family Water Alliance
 - ◆ William Hagen, Chico, California
 - ◆ Mark Hennelly, Deputy director Governmental Affairs, California Waterfowl Association
 - ◆ John Merz, President, Sacramento River Preservation Trust
 - ◆ Steve Shaffer, Director, Department of Food and Agriculture

B-1 Summary of the December 1, 2003 Public Input Meeting

Location: Chico City Council Chambers @ 7:00 p.m.
Project Staff: P. Hofmann, P. Ward & H. Lomeli (DFG) – G. Werner (TNC)
Public Attendance: 23 persons

The meeting began with a welcome and introduction by Paul Hofmann. A PowerPoint presentation was then given by Gregg Werner that overviewed the Draft Comprehensive Management Plan. Questions regarding the Draft Plan were solicited from the audience. Questions and related discussions included the following topics:

- The contents of the Draft Plan.
- The process for final revision, approval and implementation of the Plan
- The current State budget situation and the potential for funding of Wildlife Area operations in the future.
- The status of the Comprehensive Conservation Plan for the Sacramento River National Wildlife Refuge and coordination between the Department and USFWS.

The project team provided responses to the questions and substantial discussion with the audience occurred.

Comments regarding the contents Draft Plan were then solicited and related discussion occurred. A summary of the substantive comments received is listed below.

- ◆ The proposed regulation change to permit camping on gravel bars should be addressed and accommodated as soon as possible. Regulation from other rivers in the west should be consulted as examples. A maximum standard of distance from the river should be considered as part of the regulation change.
- ◆ An overall policy should be included in the Plan to provide for a balance of resources to be devoted to the various functions of the Wildlife Area management in the future.
- ◆ The Plan should establish clearly defined priorities for available budgetary resources that are predetermined and available for use by the Department.
- ◆ The Plan should be reviewed and approved by the State Fish and Game Commission.
- ◆ A list of potential volunteer improvement or maintenance projects should be developed and maintained for the Wildlife Area to accommodate and encourage volunteer efforts by various conservation organizations such as fly fishing clubs.

A substantial discussion of these comments occurred and the meeting extended until approximately 9:00 p.m. when it was adjourned.

B-2 Summary of the December 4, 2003 Public Input Meeting

Location: Colusa Industrial Properties Meeting Room @ 7:00 p.m.
Project Staff: P. Hofmann, H. Lomeli (DFG) – G. Werner (TNC)
Public Attendance: 14 persons

The meeting began with a welcome and introduction by Paul Hofmann. A PowerPoint presentation was then given by Gregg Werner that overviewed the Draft Comprehensive Management Plan. Questions regarding the Draft Plan were solicited from the audience and numerous questions were raised including the following:

- The contents of the Draft Plan.
- The location of the Wildlife Area properties.
- The potential for expansion of the Wildlife Area in the future.
- The process for acquisition of properties by the Department and The Nature Conservancy.
- Provisions for access to and signing of Wildlife Area properties.
- Vegetation clearance that occurs as part of levee maintenance.
- Hydrologic analysis and review of restoration projects by the Reclamation Board.
- The planting process for restoration of properties.

The project team provided responses to the questions and substantial discussion with the audience occurred.

Comments regarding the contents Draft Plan were then solicited and related discussion occurred. A summary of the substantive comment received is listed below.

- ◆ The Plan should contain a specific mechanism to resolve impacts on agricultural properties that are related to the Wildlife Area or restoration of habitat..

A substantial discussion of this comment occurred and reference was made to the ongoing attempts to deal with “Good Neighbor” concerns through the SRCAF and the CALFED Program. A discussion of a specific situation involving depredation of an orchard area followed

The meeting extended until approximately 9:15 p.m. when it was adjourned.

